

App'n No. 09/575,123
Amdt. Dated May 22, 2006
Response to Office Action of April 13, 2006

2

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action dated April 13, 2006.

The Applicant notes the Examiner's withdrawal of all rejections in view of Dymetman.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's analysis of Dougherty and, therefore, contests the obviousness rejections based on Dougherty.

The Examiner asserts that Dougherty discloses coded tags with "each tag being indicative of a page identity and of its own location on the page". The Examiner makes reference to column 5, lines 44-49 & 65-67 of Dougherty in support of this assertion.

However, the most relevant passage of Dougherty at column 5, lines 46-49 only states that:

The content encoded within the document ID hotspot 33 will, however, be special in that it provides an indication of the identity of the particular encoded physical medium 30.

Dougherty teaches that the hotspots 33 indicate the identity of a page. However, Dougherty does not teach anywhere that each hotspot 33 should indicate its own location on the page, as required by claim 1 of the present application. Of course, each of Dougherty's hotspots 33 must be located *somewhere* on a page (in the sense that anything printed on a page must be located somewhere). The difference is that there is no data encoded into Dougherty's hotspots, which indicates the location of that hotspot on the page.

This difference is crucial to how Dougherty's system and the Applicant's netpage system function. The present invention delivers interactive pages, which allow a pen to determine its position on a page by reading a tag having location-indicating data encoded therein. By contrast, Dougherty's system delivers interactive pages having hotspots, which do not allow a pen to determine its position on a page. Dougherty's pages would only allow a pen to determine the identity of the page, as taught by column 5, lines 46-49 of Dougherty.

A further difference between the present invention and Dougherty is that Dougherty does not perform the step of "associating the page identity with the description of the interactive element". The description of the interactive element includes a description of the zone of the interactive element on the page (claim 1 – step(b)). This is a crucial step in the present invention, because this associated information allows the computer system to determine if a pen is located within a zone of an interactive element on a particular page. Dougherty does not perform such an association because he does not need to – Dougherty's hotspots 33 do not provide any location information to a pen reading the hotspot, and so an association between a page identity and a description of a zone of each hotspot is unnecessary for Dougherty. At column 9, lines 18-21, Dougherty describes insertion of encoded content into appropriate locations within a representation of a page. Of course, Dougherty must designate a zone for each hotspot on a page for printing, in the same way that any graphics must be designated a zone for printing on a page. Again, everything printed on a page has to go *somewhere*. However, Dougherty makes no association between a description of a zone of a hotspot and a page identity.

Appln No. 09/575,123
Andt. Dated May 22, 2006
Response to Office Action of April 13, 2006

3

A further difference between the present invention and Dougherty is that, while Dougherty generates dot data for each hotspot using the page identity, the resulting hotspot generated by Dougherty is not indicative of its own location on a page. In the present invention, the page identity is used to generate a tag indicative of a page identity *and* its own location on a page. In Dougherty, the page identity is used to generate a hotspot, which is indicative *only* of a page identity, not its own location on a page.

In summary, it is submitted that Dougherty's page generation and printing process, as described in Figure 3 and column 9, lines 10-26, simply mirrors a standard process, which could equally be used for printing barcodes onto a page. Identity data for each hotspot is generated, a zone of each page is designated for that data, the data is inserted into that zone and finally the page is printed. The process does not generate location data for each hotspot and, crucially, does not associate a page identity with a description of an interactive element, which includes a description of a zone of that interactive element.

Dougherty's system is not configured for generating interactive pages, which can be used in a system requiring a pen determining its own position on a page by reading data tags. Dougherty's system is more akin to a standard barcode system. As was admitted in the most recent Office Action, Dymetman does not teach the skilled person how he can generate and print interactive pages having identity- and location-indicating tags on demand (*i.e.* at the click of a button). Dougherty does not provide the skilled person with any solutions to this problem, because Dougherty's system function in an entirely different way.

Given the differences between the present invention and Dougherty, and given the different ways in which the two systems function, it is submitted that the skilled person would not have been able to arrive the present invention from the teachings of Dougherty. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that the present invention is not obvious in view of Dougherty.

It is submitted that all the Examiner's objections have been traversed. Reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully solicited.

Very respectfully,
Applicant:


KIA SILVERBROOK

Applicant:


PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762